

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

AUG 15 1982

ERISA COLLECTION

**2328<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 14 JANUARY 1982

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2328) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The situation in the occupied Arab territories:	
(a) Resolution 497 (1981);	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General (S/14821) .....	1

#### NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

## 2328th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 14 January 1982, at 3.30 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Oleg. A. TROYANOVSKY  
(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Panama, Poland, Spain, Togo, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2328)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the occupied Arab territories:
  - (a) Resolution 497 (1981);
  - (b) Report of the Secretary-General (S/14821)

*The meeting was called to order at 4.20 p.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

#### The situation in the occupied Arab territories:

- (a) **Resolution 497 (1981);**
- (b) **Report of the Secretary-General (S/14821)**

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings [2322nd to 2325th and 2327th meetings], I invite the representative of Israel and the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to take places at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber; I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Blum (Israel) and Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) took places at the Council table; Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Bed-*

*jaoui (Algeria), Mr. Kaiser (Bangladesh), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Bwakira (Burundi), Mr. Roa Kourí (Cuba), Mr. Suja (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Ghikas (Greece), Mr. Rácz (Hungary), Mr. Krishnan (India), Mr. Djalal (Indonesia), Mr. Al-Ali (Iraq), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Kittikhoun (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Muntasser (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Ould Sid'Ahmed (Mauritania), Mr. Dashtseren (Mongolia), Mr. Mrani Zentar (Morocco), Mr. Bendaña Rodríguez (Nicaragua), Mr. Sulaiman (Oman), Mr. Mahmood (Pakistan), Mr. Medina (Portugal), Mr. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. Allagany (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. De Silva (Sri Lanka), Mr. Abdalla (Sudan), Mr. Kravets (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Al-Qasimi (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Ha Van Lau (Viet Nam), Mr. Mubarez (Yemen) and Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber; Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.*

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): Members of the Council have before them document S/14832 which contains the text of a draft resolution sponsored by Jordan.

3. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): This is a fateful moment in the history of the United Nations. The overwhelming majority of mankind has been anxiously awaiting the outcome of our extensive deliberations over the past 10 days. Representatives of a wide spectrum of humanity from all corners of the world, of diverse ideologies, political systems, regions and affiliations, have spoken with one emphatic voice in expressing their abhorrence and shock and their determination that brazen relentless Israeli aggression must not be allowed to go unpunished and unchecked.

4. I have no intention of dramatizing a situation which has already, through persistent, relentless and calculated acts of aggression and lawlessness, gone far beyond anything that could be redressed by abject acquiescence, slapping of the wrist or formal verbal condemnations and denunciations. A self-proclaimed and expansionist Israel has placed itself outside the framework of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. Enough is enough, for the overwhelming majority of mankind. Those States which misguidedly might try to bail it out, either wilfully or in consequence of ransomed wills and resolve to

perform their obligations to the Charter, cannot but be regarded as accessories and accomplices in the crime of blatant aggression against the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of one of our Member States. This is totally unacceptable and inexcusable and will not fail categorically to identify those whose fidelity to the Charter and to peace is genuine and not just deceptive lip-service, and the rest of mankind, whose paramount concern is for a continued and effective United Nations as the only guarantor of an orderly international order as well as of international peace and security. The Israeli aggressors are unabashedly determined to destroy both. The case before us, therefore, is Begin versus the community of nations, 3 million well-connected Israelis versus the destiny of 3 to 4 billion people of our planet. This is indeed a watershed, a turning point, and the time has arrived to face it squarely.

5. I had the honour yesterday afternoon to submit the draft resolution contained in document S/14832. That draft which, Mr. President, with your permission I now wish to explain to the Council, is not just a Jordanian draft but is the concerted and unanimous draft of the Arab world represented in the League of Arab States, with the consensus support of the non-aligned movement and the valuable support of all other regions and friendly and peace-loving countries.

6. We regard the draft resolution as a first step in the implementation of Chapter VII of the Charter. Article 42 of Chapter VII states that

“Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate . . . it may take [additional measures] as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.”

7. The Arab world is facing all-out aggression against its domains and its peoples. It is determined that this all-out onslaught be defeated and repelled by all possible means, as provided for in the Charter itself.

8. I should like to spell out the provisions of draft resolution S/14832 in the most earnest hope that it will meet with the positive response commensurate with the enormity of the aggression imposed upon the Arab world by Israel's undisputed acts of aggression.

9. The draft resolution which my delegation had the honour to submit yesterday afternoon and which has since been circulated to all Member States is self-explanatory. It recalls Council resolution 497 (1981). It further recalls the three reports prepared by the Secretary-General at the behest of the Council, and in particular the report contained in document S/14821, dated 31 December 1981. These reports unequivocally establish Israel's defiance of resolution 497 (1981) on which it was decided that in the event of non-compliance by Israel, the Council would meet urgently “to consider taking appropriate measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”.

10. If the intent of the Council has been merely to reiterate words such as “condemnation” and “illegality” and other expressions of dismay, then it would not have decided to take appropriate measures in accordance with the Charter—because that is not the term used in the Charter. That was an unmistakably action-oriented decision and its ingredients are meticulously spelt out in Chapter VII of the Charter.

11. It is most pertinent that the draft resolution recalls General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), adopted on 14 December 1974, in which, after years of collective thinking and assessment, the Assembly defined in article 3 of the annex, an act of aggression as

“The invasion or attack by the armed forces of a State of the territory of another State, or any military occupation, however temporary, resulting from such invasion or attack, or any annexation by the use of force of the territory of another State or part thereof”.

Nothing could be clearer or more explicit than the General Assembly formulation representing the consensus and considered view of mankind.

12. The latest Israeli measures in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights and Israel's imposition of its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights not only constitute a clear-cut act of aggression as spelt out in the Charter, by the General Assembly, by the Security Council and in various Hague and Geneva conventions, but also constitute a continuing threat to peace and security in the region, as well as in our interrelated world. It is a time bomb set off by a deranged Israeli leadership bent on setting the entire Middle East and beyond aflame. There is no dearth of inflammatory material in the area, both physically and psychologically, to ensure an unfathomable inferno. Perhaps this is precisely what Israel would like to see happen, considering the monumental reservoir of enmity that it holds towards numerous peoples and regions in the world.

13. Having endured millenia of hardships in our part of the world, the Arab world cannot be daunted by Israeli blackmail and its horrendous consequences. The primacy in our priorities nurtured in our history and system of values is that national territories are never alienable, nor are honour and justice amenable to being sacrificed for material gains, no matter how great their magnitude. As I stated earlier, the entire legacy and destiny of the Arab nation face grave jeopardy, and we shall not fail in our duty to repulse it, regardless of the price.

14. But what the Council should most seriously address itself to, apart from our own problem, is the welfare and continued functioning of the world economy and peace, which would be seriously, if not

mortally, wounded should the Council fail to confront the challenge of Israeli lawlessness and aggression.

15. It is therefore incumbent upon the Council, whether representing the industrialized countries or the developing world, to bring Israel to its senses and to avert a cataclysm of incalculable proportions. Permissiveness, double standards and favouritism may in the very short run be clever politics, but can the world afford its inevitable and catastrophic ramifications?

16. I am not making any insinuations whatsoever, but simply bringing to the attention of the Council what I am convinced will come to pass.

17. The draft resolution before us invokes Articles 39 and 41 of the Charter. It will be seen that the provisions which the draft contains are selective and by no means comprehensive, to facilitate its acceptance, notwithstanding the fact that the Israeli acts are the ultimate under a definition of aggression. In comparison with other resolutions adopted under Chapter VII, and in particular draft resolution S/13735 of 10 January 1980, with which my delegation sympathized because of the humanitarian element involved, the present draft is truly minimal and, as I stated earlier, a mere first step and an acid test of whether the United Nations.

18. Such being the case, it is the earnest hope and faith of my delegation that the draft will be adopted without equivocation or ambivalence.

19. While the Jordanian delegation requests that the draft resolution be put to the vote, we fully recognize that the decision on this matter is the prerogative of the President, who, in consultations with member States, can best assess what would be the most appropriate time to put this draft to the vote.

20. Mr. WYZNER (Poland): Comrade President, allow me first to offer you my delegation's heartfelt congratulations on your assumption of the Council's presidency for the month of January. We are particularly pleased to see you, a representative of the allied and fraternal Soviet Union, with which my country maintains relations of friendship as well as close and comprehensive co-operation, presiding over our work in what certainly is an important period in the activities of the Council. We are fully confident that your diplomatic talents, widely recognized expertise and qualities of leadership will enable you to discharge your complex and sensitive duties with particular distinction.

21. I could not fail to join others in expressing admiration and thanks to Mr. Otunnu of Uganda for the truly spectacular manner in which he presided over crucial and delicate deliberations during the last month of the past year.

22. It gives me special pleasure to express here our warm congratulations and best wishes to the new

Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar. His outstanding diplomatic skills and dedication to the lofty purposes of the United Nations have been amply illustrated in the course of a distinguished career, including a long association with the Organization. We wish to assure him of our support in the discharge of his weighty responsibilities.

23. I should also like to convey to his predecessor, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, the expressions of our sincere appreciation for the high competence, dedication and talent he displayed during his long service with the Organization.

24. May I also be permitted to say how pleased we are to commence this term of ours in the company of Guyana, Jordan, Togo and Zaire, countries to which Poland is bound by durable ties of friendly and fruitful co-operation, I would likewise wish to join in the expressions of praise of the outgoing members of the Security Council: the German Democratic Republic, the country that we succeed here as a member of the Group of the socialist States of Eastern Europe, and Mexico, Niger, the Philippines and Tunisia, whose remarkable contributions to the work of the Council we all value highly.

25. May I also share in the expressions of thanks and best wishes addressed to our esteemed and dear colleague, Mr. Peter Florin, who is shortly leaving his present post.

26. In addition I wish to express my most sincere appreciation for the kind words of welcome addressed to my country by you, Sir, and other speakers.

27. Poland is privileged to serve on the Council as one of its non-permanent members for the fourth time. This is undoubtedly a sign of recognition by the international community of the contribution which my country has sought to make in the area of international security, in particular within the Organization. We regard our membership in the Council as both an honour and a responsibility. We are conscious that this responsibility consists in contributing to the utmost of our possibilities to the Council's effective discharge of its primary task, the maintenance of international peace and security, as set out in Article 24, paragraph 1, of the Charter of the United Nations.

28. On 24 September 1981, addressing the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session, Jozef Czyrek, Minister for Foreign Affairs, referred to our awareness of the necessity of firmly counteracting everything that worsens the international situation and to Poland's traditional involvement in moulding peaceful relations in Europe and in the world at large.<sup>1</sup>

29. Minister Czyrek's words remain equally valid today and apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the attitude Poland shall adopt in discharging its duties as a member of the Council. The *spiritus movens* of our actions

in the Council will always be relentless striving for international peace and security, constant efforts towards mutual understanding and co-operation and respect for the Charter. It is in this spirit that I offer my delegation's full co-operation with other members of the Council towards the effective discharge of its statutory responsibilities.

30. My country's position concerning the conflict in the Middle East has been made known on several occasions and in unequivocal terms both in a number of United Nations bodies, including the Council, and in various forums outside the Organization. There is therefore no need for me to repeat it in detail and at length. Let me say only that along with other socialist countries we have consistently advocated a political and negotiated solution, stressing that a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the problem requires the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from all the Arab territories occupied since June 1967, realization of the inalienable right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination, including the establishment of its own independent State, and the safeguarding of the sovereignty and security of all States of the region.

31. Our contribution towards such a settlement has been made not merely in terms of verbal political support. Members of the Council will recall that Polish contingents have been serving with the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force since its inception in 1974, as they served with the United Nations Emergency Force throughout its existence.

32. With regard to that specific aspects of the situation in the Middle East that led to our present debate—namely, Israel's decision to apply its laws, jurisdiction and administration to the Golan Heights—on 21 December 1981 the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Poland issued a statement in which it declared the following:

“This question is a *de facto* attempt to annex the Golan Heights and constitutes yet another confirmation of the policy of aggression and expansion conducted for years by Israel towards the Arab peoples. The adoption of this decision aggravates further the already tense situation in the Middle East, threatens to have serious implications for international peace and security and makes more distant and complicated the attainment of a just settlement of the conflict in the Middle East. Expressing its resolute protest and deep indignation at this act, the Government of Poland fully supports the resolution adopted by the Security Council on 17 December [*resolution 497 (1981)*], in which the Council declared this decision null and void and without international legal effect. Poland will continue to demonstrate its solidarity with the struggle of the Syrian and other Arab peoples for a just political comprehensive solution of the Middle East conflict, a solution which would serve the cause of peace and security in the region of the Middle East and in the world.”

33. The Council is meeting today pursuant to paragraph 4 of its resolution 497 (1981), in order “to consider taking appropriate measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”, in the face of Israel's non-compliance with paragraph 2 which demands that Israel should rescind forthwith its decision to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights—a decision which, for all practical purposes, was tantamount to the outright annexation of a part of the territory of another Member State of the United Nations. That non-compliance has been confirmed by the Secretary-General in his reports to the General Assembly and to the Council of 21 December and 31 December 1981 [*S/14805 and S/14821*].

34. In our view the Council is therefore meeting not to decide what to do about the decision to annex the Golan Heights, because it has already rendered its decision on that part of the problem under consideration. In actual fact we are meeting today to decide what action to take in response to Israel's non-compliance with resolution 497 (1981), which constitutes a clear violation of Article 25 of the Charter, which states that “the Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter”.

35. The Council is also faced with and called upon to react to Israel's repeated violations of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, referred to in short as the principle of inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by force; its unilateral, and thus unlawful, negation of the provisions of the Agreement on Disengagement between Israeli and Syrian Forces of 30 May 1974 [*S/11302/Add.1, annex I*]; its violations of the relevant provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949;<sup>2</sup> and its continuous violations of the well-known relevant Security Council resolutions which constitute the international foundation of the peace process in the Middle East. The flouting of Council resolution 465 (1980), also unanimously adopted, should be added to this list—which is far from being exhaustive.

36. Only slightly outside the direct scope of this debate, but certainly relevant to the general background of Israeli-created lawlessness, would be a reference to Security Council resolution 478 (1980) concerning the status of Jerusalem.

37. The sober assessment of the situation created—or, should I say, compounded—by the Knesset's decision of 14 December 1981 has led numerous eminent statesmen to clear conclusions. Allow me to mention in this connection that the Secretary-General stated the following on 15 December 1981:

“Such measures are in clear contravention of United Nations resolutions. They can only heighten tension in the area and become an additional obstacle to

efforts to achieve a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement in the Middle East.”

38. Before concluding, I should like to sum up the basic facts.

39. Syria is the sole sovereign over the Golan Heights. Any arbitrary attempt to change the status of that part of Syrian territory constitutes *de facto* annexation. Such an act is therefore nothing else but repeated aggression and a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations. Since it can only aggravate the situation in the region, increase the already existing serious tension and make a just and final settlement even more remote, the Israeli decision which resulted from and was facilitated by a policy of separate solutions cannot but emphasize more forcefully than ever the utmost urgency of achieving a global political settlement.

40. Against the background of all that I have said one thing stands out clearly: the Council is duty-bound to take swift and effective action lest it allow its authority and credibility to be seriously impaired. If—as we are deeply convinced—that is the case, then the only avenue for action left to the Council is to invoke relevant provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, as requested *inter alia* by the General Assembly in paragraph 6 of its resolution 36/226 B of 17 December 1981.

41. My delegation is therefore ready to co-operate with the Council's employment of appropriate measures under Article 41 of the Charter in order to compel Israel to rescind the unlawful annexation of the Golan Heights. It is in this spirit that we welcome the draft resolution [S/14832], so ably presented by the representative of Jordan, which, among other things, in operative paragraph 3, would have the Council decide that all Member States should:

“(a) Refrain from supplying Israel with any weapons and related military equipment and suspend any military assistance to Israel;

“(b) Suspend economic, financial and technological assistance to Israel”.

42. My delegation believes that those sanctions are judicious and fully warranted. It is indeed the least that the Council can do in order to express its determination to stand firm against the contemptuous disregard that Israel has been continuously displaying for the Charter, other important international instruments and countless United Nations resolutions, including several unanimously adopted resolutions of the Council.

43. We shall therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution before us.

44. Mr. AMEGA (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): It is my pleasure, as we take up the first

business of the year 1982 in the Council, where I am taking a seat for the first time, to convey greetings to you, Mr. President, and to thank you most sincerely for the kind words of welcome addressed to my delegation. I extend these thanks also to the members of the Council and to those delegations which have been kind enough to greet us. I should also like to express thanks to the Member States of the United Nations for having placed their trust in my country, Togo, by electing us to the Security Council.

45. On behalf of the President of the Republic of Togo, Army General Gnassingbe Eyadema, on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf, I should like to assure you of our deep gratitude and to say that we are determined to abide by the rules governing the work of the Council and to work unstintingly for the maintenance of international peace and security. An experienced observer who has followed our foreign and domestic policy during the past 10 years will recognize that peace and stability are constants of our behaviour; that is why our action in the Council will be guided by an ongoing quest for such peace and such stability throughout the world.

46. Mr. President, I am sure that I can rely in advance on your indulgence and understanding and on that of the members of the Council in carrying out my mandate, a mandate which consists essentially of participating in the search for solutions to the conflicts which are troubling the world and which call into question one of the fundamental characteristics of man: his reason.

47. If we look at the many serious conflicts which exist, we are led to say that, increasingly, the irrational is replacing the rational in determining human behaviour. How else can we explain the persistent crises buffeting southern Africa, South-East Asia, the Gulf and, in particular, the Middle East, where the annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights by Israel on 14 December 1981 constituted a new escalation of the Israeli-Arab conflict? How else can we explain, within the framework of that conflict, the fact that Israel denies the Palestinian people the exercise of their inalienable rights, including the right to establish a State? How else can we explain the refusal of the Palestinians and some Arab States to accept the existence of Israel within secure and recognized boundaries?

48. Before I go on, Mr. President, may I address warm congratulations on behalf of my delegation to your predecessor, Mr. Otunnu, representative of Uganda, for the outstanding way in which he presided over the Council last month, during a particularly difficult time for the United Nations.

49. I should also like on behalf of my country to address our sincere congratulations to the new Secretary General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, on his election to head the Secretariat. I am sure that, given his

former functions, he has a natural aptitude to lead the Organization in an efficient manner towards the attainment of its objectives. I extend congratulations to Mr. Kurt Waldheim for the outstanding work done during the last 10 years of devotion to and sustained effort for peace in the world and I wish him all the success that is his due in his new responsibilities.

50. I also wish to congratulate Guyana, Jordan, Poland and Zaire, which were elected to the Council at the same time as we were. I must mention also the German Democratic Republic, Mexico, the Niger, the Philippines and Tunisia, which need no further praise for the effective work they accomplished during their terms of office. I can assure them that we shall prove ourselves worthy successors.

51. The international community unanimously condemned the law enacted on 14 December 1981 by the Knesset aimed at imposing Israeli laws, jurisdiction and administration in the Syrian Golan Heights, occupied since 1967. That unilateral decision, which is in fact purely and simply an annexation of the territory, is a flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, of international law—particularly the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force—and of the relevant resolutions of the Organization, particularly Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). Furthermore, it is in complete contradiction to article 47 of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,<sup>2</sup> a convention to which Israel is, moreover, a party and which forbids the occupying Power to modify the legal status of the occupied territory. Finally, that decision merely increases tension in a region in which the situation is already disquieting. In that respect, it dangerously jeopardizes the efforts made to bring about a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Arab conflict and the establishment of a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the region.

52. For all those reasons, it is understandable that the Council unanimously opposed the Israeli decision by adopting resolution 497 (1981). In that resolution, it rightly states that the decision taken by Israel is null and void and without international legal effect. It further demands that Israel rescind its decision forthwith, and decides that in the event of non-compliance by Israel, the Council would, at its present series of meetings, consider "taking appropriate measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations."

53. The present series of meetings of the Council in effect demonstrates that we have taken note of Israel's refusal to rescind its unlawful and illegal decision to annex the Syrian Golan Heights, which it occupies. This refusal again places the region on the threshold of a new war and thus threatens international peace and security, the maintenance of which is the main responsibility of the Council. Consequently, my delegation hopes that the Council will be in a position itself

to implement its resolution 497 (1981), particularly paragraph 4. It has no choice but to have recourse to Chapter VII of the Charter. My delegation is ready to support any action by the Council along those lines for two reasons: first, it is convinced that such an action would demonstrate the will and the capability of the Council to meet the responsibilities incumbent upon it under the Charter, which could only enhance its credibility as well as that of the United Nations; secondly, we think that such an action would defuse the crisis in the immediate future by giving hope to the wronged party and avoiding a situation where it would feel that it had no way out other than that of desperate action.

54. At the beginning of my statement, I pointed out that, increasingly, the irrational is replacing the rational in determining human behaviour. Just the opposite would be more to my liking; thus, I should like to close by appealing for a return to reason, to wisdom, to moderation and to tolerance in the Middle East.

55. In order to facilitate a settlement of the Israeli-Arab conflict and to avoid a new war in the Middle East, the Council has an important part to play by demonstrating moderation, appealing to tolerance and, when necessary, bringing pressure to bear on the parties involved. It is therefore important that the Council fully assume its responsibilities and I hope it will not shirk them. That is the price of peace in the world.

56. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Burundi. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

57. Mr. BWAKIRA (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, it is an honour for me to speak in the Council and I thank you for having allowed me to do so. Before stating my delegation's views on "the situation in the occupied Arab territories", I should like to express to you, on behalf both of my delegation and of the Group of African States, of which I have the honour to be Chairman for the month of January, heartfelt congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council which, we hope, will find during these meetings an adequate solution to the question which is of concern to the international community.

58. I am all the more happy to see you presiding over the Council as you represent a country which plays an important role in international relations and which has relations of fruitful co-operation with my own country. Your qualities as an astute diplomat and your experience are guarantees that this debate will be successful.

59. I should also like to pay a well-deserved tribute to your predecessor, our colleague and friend Mr. Olara Otunnu, representative of the Republic of Uganda,

who guided the work of the Council in December skilfully and efficiently. His qualities as a diplomat require no further demonstration. We are proud of him and we can say without any exaggeration that the worth of this diplomat transcends his youth.

60. I am pleased to welcome here Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar, Secretary-General, who has just taken up his lofty duties. His willingness to serve the international community and his experience make of him the statesman needed by the United Nations to meet the challenge of the prevailing international situation. The Government of Burundi once again wishes him every success and the Group of African States assures him of its modest contribution and total co-operation as he accomplishes his very important task. I wish to renew my delegation's congratulations to the new members of the Council. They are countries with which Burundi is pleased to have brotherly and friendly relations forged by history.

61. The Council met last December [2316th to 2319th meeting] following the complaint by the Syrian Arab Republic concerning the decision taken by Israel to extend the application of its laws to the Syrian territory of the Golan Heights [S/14791]. It adopted resolution 497 (1981). In that resolution, it demanded that Israel, the occupying Power, should rescind forthwith its decision to annex the Golan Heights. It decided that Israel's decision was null and void and without international legal effect. General Assembly resolution 36/226 B, adopted on 17 December on this matter by an overwhelming majority and supported by my delegation, is also unambiguous. The Assembly vigorously opposes the annexation of the Golan Heights by force because this annexation is illegal.

62. The Council is meeting once again in accordance with paragraph 4 of resolution 497 (1981), in which it is provided that it would meet to consider taking appropriate measures in the event of Israel's non-compliance with said resolution.

63. An analysis of the note addressed by the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General [S/14821, para. 3] and of his statement made before the Council [2319th meeting] makes it clear that the Israeli Government categorically refuses to comply with the Security Council's injunctions. The arguments adduced by Israel do not convince anyone.

64. Since 1967, when it occupied Arab territories by force, Israel has always had recourse to a pretext, that of security and secure boundaries. This pretext has provided it with an alibi to establish settlements which are a prelude to the annexation of occupied Arab territories. Israel is a recidivist. It applies to the Golan Heights the policy of aggression which it has followed in Lebanon, in Iraq and in making Jerusalem its capital. This is again defiance of the Council, arrogance towards the international community and scorn for international law.

65. In this case, non-compliance by Israel with the provisions of resolution 497 (1981) is unambiguous; it is categorical.

66. I repeat: the annexation of the Golan Heights by the Israeli Government shows scorn for international conventions, is a violation of international law and General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. It is a grave threat to peace and security, not only in the Middle East but also throughout the world. If Israel continues its expansionist policy in all directions, it will be a grave threat to the security and territorial integrity of its neighbours.

67. For great evils appropriate remedies are required. The United Nations and its special body, the Security Council, bear major responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The Council must not be indecisive in the face of the challenge posed by the Israeli Government.

68. It is high time for the Council to take appropriate measures against that State, which refuses to put an end to the virtual annexation of the Syrian territory of the Golan Heights. The credibility of the United Nations and of the Security Council is at stake. The Council must compel Israel to obey international norms. It would be an unfortunate precedent, with grave consequences, if Israel, a State Member of the United Nations, having committed the illegal act of annexing a territory belonging to a sovereign State, were not subjected to sanctions by the Council, to set an example. In these circumstances, the acquisition of territory by force would supplant law.

69. All States Members of the United Nations are duty-bound and have the obligation to respect the principles of the Charter. Israel has no right to be the sole exception capable of allowing itself to violate the Charter of the United Nations with impunity.

70. Having deprived the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights, having expelled it from its homeland and having taken over its property and occupied its lands, Israel has embarked on a military adventure of seizing other Arab territories, including the Golan Heights, which belong to Syria. Israel is cynical in claiming that its act of expansionism and annexation was designed to protect the right of the population of the Golan Heights.

71. In line with what is stressed in the communiqué of the non-aligned countries at the beginning of this month [S/14829, annex], my delegation wishes to express its concern at Israel's defiance of Security Council resolution 497 (1981) and General Assembly resolution 36/226 B.

72. The annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights is—need it really be recalled?—an obvious act of aggression, as stipulated in Article 39 of the Charter and in General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX). That is why

it is imperative for the international community to impose forthwith adequate sanctions under Article 41 of the Charter.

73. We believe that the Council should adopt appropriate measures, as set forth in Chapter VII of the Charter, to force the Government of Israel to return to the Syrian Arab Republic all its territories, which it has occupied and continues to occupy illegally.

74. Finally, I should like to reaffirm our active solidarity with and support for the people and the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic.

75. Mr. LING Qing (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Mr. President, first of all, on behalf of the Chinese delegation, I would like to offer you our sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the current month.

76. I would also like to express our appreciation to Mr. Otunnu for his outstanding statesmanship and diplomatic skills while serving as President of the Council during last December.

77. Moreover, I warmly welcome the delegations of Guyana, Jordan, Poland, Togo and Zaire to participate in the work of the Council, to which, we are sure, they will make useful and fruitful contributions.

78. I would also like to take this opportunity to extend a warm welcome to Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar on his assumption of the important post of Secretary-General. I am certain that while discharging his important task he will heed the aspirations of the people of the world, respect the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and make positive contributions to the maintenance of world peace and security and to the promotion of friendly co-operation on an equal footing among all nations of the world.

79. In the statements in the Council over the past few days, representatives from various countries expressed the deep concern of the international community over the present development in the Middle East situation. As is known to all, the defence of the national sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of States constitutes a basic principle in international law and is an important norm of the conduct of States recognized by the entire international community. The Charter stipulates clearly that all Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. The Israeli authorities, in total disregard of international law and regulations, grossly trampled on the Charter concerning the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and brazenly passed a bill in the Knesset to annex the Syrian Golan Heights, which they had occupied by force. Their action was a further encroachment upon the sovereignty and

territorial integrity of Syria, aggravating the tensions in the Middle East and seriously affecting the peace and stability of the Middle East region and of the world.

80. Faced with such a grave situation, the Council met urgently and adopted resolution 497 (1981) declaring the Israeli decision to annex the Golan Heights null and void, and demanding that Israel rescind forthwith its decision. Yet, to date, the Israeli authorities have refused to comply with the relevant resolutions of the Council, adamantly maintained their aggressive and expansionist stand, and insisted on considering the Golan Heights—1,600 square kilometres of Syrian territory—as their own. Such blatant truculence on the part of the Israeli authorities fully exposes their arrogant stand that they are bent on remaining hostile to the Palestinian and Arab peoples and on flouting the Charter and Council resolutions. Under such circumstances, simply to “condemn” or “strongly condemn” Israel time and again for its atrocities will be to no avail. It is incumbent upon the Council to uphold justice and, in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter, adopt firm and effective measures to impose sanctions on Israel. Otherwise, Israel the aggressor will be allowed to occupy and annex the territories of others by mere force, in which case the solemn Charter of the United Nations will be trampled underfoot, and what then would become of the noble functions of the Council? What happens today in the Golan Heights could very well recur in other Arab nations, what happens today in the Middle East could very well recur elsewhere in the world and aggressors would become even more reckless and unbridled. If things were allowed to continue this way, how could the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of small and weak countries be guaranteed? How would world peace and security be safeguarded?

81. The Chinese Government has always considered illegal and null and void any Israeli measures to permanently occupy Arab territories. We have consistently stood by the Arab, Syrian and Palestinian peoples and resolutely supported their just struggle to recover their lost territories and to regain their national rights. We resolutely support the just stand of the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic. Since the Israeli authorities refuse to implement the Council's resolutions, the latter should, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, take the necessary measures of sanctions to deal with Israeli acts of aggression, thus preserving the credibility of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. We resolutely support the draft resolution submitted by Jordan [S/14832].

82. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of the United Arab Emirates. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

83. Mr. AL-QASIMI (United Arab Emirates): I wish at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on behalf

of my delegation, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of January. Your proven skills and vast experience in diplomacy and foreign affairs will undoubtedly guarantee that our vocation dedicated to peace with justice will be crowned with success.

84. To your predecessor, Mr. Otunnu of Uganda, I also extend my congratulations for conducting the business of the Council in the most skilful manner, which earned him the respect and admiration of us all.

85. I take this opportunity to extend my delegation's felicitations to Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar, the new Secretary-General, on the occasion of his assumption of his post. Recognizing his skills, extensive experience, and dedication to the ideals and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, we are confident that under his stewardship the Organization will march forward in the pursuit of the establishment of a world public order based on peace coupled with justice.

86. The Council is meeting once again to consider another act of aggression perpetrated by Israel.

87. The first phase of such consideration was the unanimous adoption by the Council of resolution 497 (1981) on 17 December 1981. In that resolution the Council decided that the Israeli decision to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights was null and void and without international legal effect. It demanded that Israel, the occupying Power, should rescind forthwith its decision. It also decided, in the event of non-compliance by Israel, to meet, not later than 5 January 1982, to consider taking appropriate measures in accordance with the Charter.

88. Israel's response was not only a refusal to rescind the annexation, but also a total rejection of the Council's resolution. That response was manifested in the statements made by several Israeli spokesmen as well as in the two reports submitted by the Secretary-General [S/14805 and S/14821].

89. Israel's response is another glaring example of its defiance of the injunctions of the Council and its contemptuous attitude towards the will of the international community. It is imperative, therefore, for the Council to embark on the second stage of its consideration of the Israeli act of aggression by taking against Israel the appropriate measures prescribed in Chapter VII of the Charter.

90. The case before the Council is very clear. It has two elements. The first is the annexation of the Golan Heights, which is an act of aggression in accordance with article 3 of the Definition of Aggression contained in the annex to General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974. The article defines an act of aggression, *inter alia*, as:

"The invasion or attack by the armed forces of a State of the territory of another State, or any military occupation, however temporary, resulting from such invasion or attack, or any annexation by the use of force of the territory of another State or part thereof".

91. The second element of the case is the Israeli refusal to rescind its legislative decision embodying the act of aggression, in defiance of the Council's injunction.

92. What is left to the Council, therefore, is to invoke against Israel Article 41 of the Charter, which involves the application of sanctions. To do otherwise would be tantamount to the abdication of its responsibilities and duties. To act in another way would be a violation of the task entrusted it under the Charter. To sidestep the issue before it would be a total obliteration of the meaning of Article 41 as well as of its spirit. To embark in a different manner would erode the authority of the United Nations and lead it downhill on the path and towards the fate of its predecessor, the League of Nations.

93. The drafters of the Charter of the United Nations prescribed Article 41 as a means to deter aggression, to punish aggressors and to deny aggressors the enjoyment of the fruits of aggression. The drafters also entrusted primary responsibility to the permanent members of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security. Such responsibility involves readiness and commitment by the big Powers concerning the application of sanctions against aggressors in accordance with Article 41.

94. In the light of the foregoing, my delegation views with grave concern the declared intention of the Government of the United States to veto any draft resolutions embodying the application of sanctions against Israel. We cannot separate that intention from the attitude of the United States in blocking the adoption by the Council of similar draft resolutions concerning the two previous acts of aggression perpetrated by Israel against the Iraqi nuclear installation and against Lebanese and Palestinian civilians in Beirut and southern Lebanon.

95. Had it not been for the continuous and massive flow of assistance rendered by the Government of the United States to Israel, the Israeli authorities would not have dared commit acts of aggression against the Arabs. Israel, similarly, would not have dared treat the Council's resolution with defiance and contempt.

96. In view of those facts—especially the systematic refusal by the United States to apply sanctions against Israel and its application of various types of sanctions in other situations—my delegation feels entitled to present the following pertinent questions.

97. First, why is it justifiable for the United States to seek the application of sanctions through and

outside the Council against another State for the detention of 50 hostages, and not justifiable to seek similar sanctions against Israel for holding hundreds of thousands of Palestinians and other Arabs as hostages in detention under the yoke of Israeli Nazi-like occupation?

98. Secondly, why is it permissible for the United States to apply sanctions against another State for actions taken *vis-à-vis* a dissident trade union, and not permissible to apply the same sanctions against Israel for brutal actions *vis-à-vis* the whole Arab population of the occupied Arab territories, who are all dissident concerning the alien occupation of those lands?

99. Thirdly, why is it acceptable to the United States to stipulate that the application of a trade treaty with a State should depend upon that State's granting permission to its natives—mainly those of the Jewish religion—to emigrate to Israel, and not acceptable to attach a similar stipulation to trade treaties with Israel, depending on that State's granting permission to the native Palestinian refugees to return to their homeland and property from which they were uprooted and expelled? This is more pertinent since the Universal Declaration of Human Rights<sup>3</sup> grants every person the right to leave as well as to return to his country.

100. The gamut of these questions leads us to either or both of the following conclusions: the Arabs are not entitled to proper and equal treatment, and/or Israel is considered infallible and above the law; in other words, to rephrase the British axiom "The King can do no wrong", "The Arabs can do no right and Israel can do no wrong".

101. In January 1980, exactly two years ago, a draft resolution was submitted by the United States to the Council for the application of sanctions as a means to secure the release of 50 American hostages [S/13735]. On 13 January, the day the draft resolutions was put to a vote, the representative of the United Kingdom invoked norms of international law as justification for voting in favour. He said:

"Statements in the last two months by my Prime Minister, by other British Ministers and by myself in the Security Council, on 1 and 29 December 1979 [2175th and 2182nd meetings], can leave no doubt about our conviction of the illegality of the Iranian authorities' action in terms of international law and in terms of long hallowed practice between States." [2191st meeting, para. 118]

102. The representative of France resorted to the same justification in voting for the draft resolution. He stated:

"France, like all the other members of the Security Council, has condemned the detention in Iran of American nationals and diplomats, in violation of the principles, conventions and practices most

universally recognized by the international community". [*Ibid.*, para. 133.]

He further stated that the sanctions "arise solely from the violation of international law" [*ibid.*, para. 136].

103. We believe that the issue before the Council now is more serious than the one of two years ago. At least it involves the violation of norms and principles of international law. Everybody agrees on that fact, including the United Kingdom and France. We therefore expect that these two important States will vote in favour of the draft resolution applying sanctions against Israel, just as they voted in favour two years ago with regard to the hostages.

104. The Council is facing a historic and fateful moment: either it lives up to its responsibilities or it fades into oblivion. Our cherished hope is that the Council will choose the former course and thus apply sanctions against Israel.

105. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Israel has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I now call on him.

106. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Today's meeting of the Council is, I believe, the seventh since 6 January on the agenda item before us. We have met virtually every day since Wednesday of last week to deliberate on what presumably is the central issue confronting the international community these days.

107. Certainly a deliberate attempt is being made here to create that impression, however false, and to that end apparently mobilization has been ordered within a certain group of States to lend their support to creating that artificial impression. Thus we have had here a procession of States participating in this debate. Let me mention just a few of them: Bulgaria, Mongolia, Czechoslovakia, the sovereign and independent Republic of the Ukraine, the German Republic which for some reason calls itself democratic, Hungary, Poland—and I think I might add to this category also the equally democratic Republic of Afghanistan. There is one problem, though, dealing with this category, and that is the intriguing absence of the sovereign and independent Republic of Byelorussia, which so far has not made its appearance. But who knows what lies in store for us? It may still appear.

108. Some of us have had the feeling over the past few weeks that there may be other international problems confronting the international community. The Council, it would seem, is not aware of their existence. Not for the first time there seems to be a certain divergence between the real world and the world as experienced and viewed by the Council.

109. Whatever doubts may have persisted in our minds with regard to the priorities of the Council were certainly dispelled this afternoon by the appearance of

the representative of Poland. We had been looking forward very much indeed to his statement. Some of us were hoping against hope that we might find some enlightenment on some of the problems confronting us. It is true that he did speak about solidarity—solidarity with Syria. It is gratifying to know that he supports solidarity, although it is not quite clear whether he writes it with a small “s” or a capital “S”.

110. But this is not the only problem that the representative of Poland has failed to address himself to. I believe he could have made a useful contribution to this debate, and since he took time out to participate in it—and, as he informed us, his Minister for Foreign Affairs on 21 December, one week after 13 December, also took time out to address himself to the question before us—he could have educated us on some interesting and pertinent questions arising in connection with the item before us. Certainly some of us would have been greatly interested in hearing about the evolution of his country’s boundaries.

111. I know that all these things happened a long time ago—36 years ago or so—but still they may be somewhat relevant. Since he did not see fit to enlighten us on them, I hope he will forgive me if I take the liberty to do so. So let me very briefly recapitulate some of those boundary problems.

112. In 1941 the Polish Government-in-exile stated its demand for the re-establishment of Poland after the Second World War within secure boundaries. On 24 September 1941, the Polish Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Raczynski, told a meeting of Inter-Allied Council held in London . . .

113. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I call on the representative of Poland on a point of order.

114. Mr. WYZNER (Poland): I am not quite sure what we are talking about in the Council. As far as I can see from the agenda before us, it is “The situation in the occupied Arab territories: (a) Resolution 497 (1981); (b) Report of the Secretary-General (S/14821)”.

115. We are all engaged in a very serious consideration of this important matter. I would appreciate it very much if all speakers around this table would confine themselves to this problem and kindly leave aside problems that are completely external to the discussion in which we are engaged now.

116. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): As President I would say that speakers should confine themselves to the agenda item. I call upon the representative of Israel to continue.

117. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I am exercising my right of reply, and I think that if the representative of Poland will be patient with me for a minute or two, when I shall have a number of questions to ask of him in connec-

tion with the agenda item before us, it will become very obvious to him why this historical background is not only necessary but also highly pertinent.

118. In London, in 1941, Mr. Raczynski told the Inter-Allied Council:

“The future frontiers of Poland should safeguard the country’s security . . . ; they should assure Poland’s vital need of wide access to the sea adequately protected from foreign interference”.

That can be found in Whiteman’s *Digest of International Law*, volume 3, page 284.

119. Now, those demands of Poland were reaffirmed in the General War Aims formulated by the Polish National Council in 1942:

“Poland should maintain the security of her frontiers . . . by having a large access to the sea and by obtaining [a] frontier with Germany which should be extended sufficiently towards [the] west as well as straightened and shortened.”

That is contained in the same volume of *Digest*, on page 285.

120. I anticipate the possible objection that all these demands were made by the London-based Government-in-exile, so let me inform the representative of Poland that on 22 July 1944 the Soviet-sponsored Polish Committee of National Liberation, better known as the Lublin Committee, issued a manifesto to the Polish people in which it called for

“struggle for restoration to the motherland of Polish Pomerania, Opole, Silesia, and East Prussia, for free access to the sea, for Polish frontier posts on the Oder. Poland never again will be threatened by German invasion.”

121. A year later, at the Postdam Conference, those Polish demands were basically acceded to. Let me quote from Whiteman’s *Digest of International Law*, volume 3, page 347:

“pending the final determination of Poland’s western frontier, the former German territories east of a line running from the Baltic Sea immediately west of Swinemunde, and thence along the Oder River to the confluence of the western Neisse River and along the western Neisse to the Czechoslovak frontier, including that portion of East Prussia not placed under the administration of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics . . . , shall be under the administration of the Polish State and for such purposes should not be considered as part of the Soviet zone of occupation of Germany.”

122. So what I should like to know is this: Could the representative of Poland enlighten us about the Polish

administration in those areas? Is the population of those areas in 1982 identical with that of 1945—for instance, in cities like Wroclaw and Szczecin and Poznan? And if the administration is Polish pending the conclusion of the peace treaty, what law and what jurisdiction applies in those areas?

123. I believe that the relevance of my questions is now fully evident to the representative of Poland. Is there no limit to hypocrisy, Mr. Wyzner?

124. But Mr. Wyzner is not alone. He is in good company. I have here in front of me some samples from some other participants who came to the support of Syria—very appropriately so. Let me start out with this interesting pair, Viet Nam and Cuba. Of course there are many common aspects to these two countries—

125. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I would ask the representative of Israel to address the agenda item and not divert attention to other matters.

126. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I think I am fully entitled, in exercise of my right of reply, to point out to the Council the qualifications of those who speak about aggression in international relations and their contributions to the maintenance of international peace and security.

127. Viet Nam and Cuba, these two countries of the tropical Gulag, these two countries that have introduced into international relations the tragic phenomenon of boat people, two countries that are engaged in international aggression in Asia and Africa and elsewhere: they come before the Council to sermonize about the need to combat aggression. How apt and how appropriate it is, indeed, that they should come to the support of Syria.

128. Another participant was Iraq. There cannot be the slightest doubt as to the sincerity of the Iraqi statement. The Iraqi lamentation in this particular case is as sincere as was the lamentation of the Syrian representative last June in the Council on the Iraqi complaint. What Iraq really thinks about its neighbour it brought to our attention last week in a press release of the Iraqi Mission published on 5 January as an official publication of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations. In it we read:

“The Iraqi Federation of Friendship Societies with Peoples of the World believes that world public opinion should be informed of the dirty, inhuman and immoral crime which was committed by a gang of criminals of the Assad and Khomeini régimes by detonating and demolishing the Iraq Embassy in Beirut and due to which scores of innocent people from the Embassy staff and others fell victim.”

I think I can stop here. I need not even refer to Iraq's contribution to international peace and security. It is too well known.

129. Who else rushed to Syria's support in the Council? Libya, of course—another country extremely well qualified to speak on matters of international aggression. But in this particular case Libya perhaps may be forgiven, for it has special links with Syria—confederation or union; perhaps the Syrian representative could enlighten us on the current state of relations between the two countries. So it was not unexpected and certainly not inappropriate for Libya to make an appearance here. But I think it was also helpful, because there are certain things which the Syrian representative wishes to conceal from the Council, but his Libyan allies have no such compunction.

130. Let me quote what Colonel Qaddafi, the level-headed ruler of Libya, told the National Conference of Libya last week, on 5 January:

“The Saudis say that the enemy must withdraw from the occupied Arab territories. That is not the problem. The problem is the existence of the enemy itself. The existence of the enemy itself conflicts with that of the Arab nation. Either we stay or Israel stays; anything else is nonsense. The Arabs have the right to tell the whole world that the Zionist entity constitutes a danger to the Arab existence, and therefore the Arabs should fight it.”

This in fact is the question of the Syrian representative, just as it is of his ally Muammar Qaddafi, even if here in the Council he tries, somewhat unsuccessfully—to tone down from time to time the thrust of this argument.

131. I have already made reference to the German so-called Democratic Republic, which appeared together with the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the Democratic Republic of Yemen. What these three have in common is that they are equally democratic. They surely must be very proud of their own contribution and of each other. They fully confirm the saying that “Birds of a feather flock together”.

132. In concluding this part of my reply, and since the representative of Hungary was also good enough to participate in this debate, let me tell the Council that while he was speaking I was reminded of a Hungarian proverb which says: “*Kinek vaj van a fején, ne menjen ki a napra*”. In English translation it is: “He who carries butter on his head should not go out into the sun”. The amount of butter that has been spoiled here in the course of this debate is enormous—enormous indeed.

133. The representative of Jordan made his second statement here today. He spoke among other things of the double-standard applied by the United Nations with regard to Israel on the Arab-Israel conflict. He is right. Were it not for the double-standard against my country, the situation in the Middle East would have been very different a long time ago. Were it not for the

fact that the Organization has been willing to tolerate for 34 years the ongoing aggression against my country by practically all its neighbours—until recently all its neighbours—the situation in the Middle East would have been very different. But the United Nations, for reasons well known to all of us, has been willing to tolerate this; has been willing to tolerate the fact that, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations, Arab countries, including Jordan, have totally disregarded Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, which prohibits not only the use of force but even the threat of force, and have been disregarding Article 2, paragraph 3, which provides for the peaceful settlement of international disputes. Yes, indeed, there is a double-standard.

134. But I could not help feeling that, at the same time, the representative of Jordan also injected a humorous dimension into our debate. He of all people introduced the draft resolution supporting the Syrian complaint. I think members of the Council may be interested in being informed of an official announcement made by the Government of Jordan, only last night, and broadcast on Amman Radio. In that announcement, the Jordan Ministry of the Interior blamed Syrian intelligence for an explosion which had occurred in a shop in Amman on 11 January, three days ago. That blast injured five people, including an employee of the Indian Embassy, as well as one of the persons who planted the bomb.

135. The Jordanian announcement blames a Syrian diplomat—so we are being told that right now there are diplomatic relations between the two countries—named Hisham Mustafa Kanbar, for recruiting the two civilians for Syrian intelligence. One of them was previously employed as a chauffeur of the Syrian Ambassador in Amman and the Syrian diplomat had instructed the two to engage in terrorist acts against a number of Amman shops which sell liquor in an attempt to frame religious extremist groups for the acts. The Syrian diplomat prepared the bomb with his own hands, instructed the two in its use and personally gave it to them the morning of the explosion. One of them was injured when the bomb exploded in his hand, while he was attempting to plant it in the store; the other escaped by crossing the border into Syria. Following the explosion, the Syrian diplomat also left Amman for Syria.

136. All that is part of the official announcement of the Jordanian Government. And then the Jordan Ministry of the Interior concludes:

“The Government of Jordan deplores the criminal explosion and emphasizes that such acts conducted by diplomats serving in Jordan stress that without any doubt the Government of the aforementioned diplomat”—that is Syria—“strives by way of such despicable actions to continue to sabotage the Arab effort to achieve Arab solidarity—and this at a time when the Government of the

said diplomat has declared its devotion to this solidarity.”

137. So it is all the more heartening to see that the representative of Jordan is still devoted to this show of solidarity for a country which has been accused by his Government of being involved in acts of sabotage and terrorism in his country.

138. In introducing his draft resolution, the representative of Jordan was again very selective in his references to the Definition of Aggression. But we have been through that before. Last week he shared that distinction with the representative of Syria. And lest it be forgotten, may I remind the Council again that what the representative of Jordan has again overlooked is the Definition of Aggression contained in the annex to the resolution adopted by the General Assembly [*resolution 3314 (XXIX)*]. Let me quote from it again, namely, articles 1 and 2:

“Aggression is the use of armed force by a State against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of another State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations, as set out in this Definition.

“*Explanatory note:* In this Definition the term ‘State’:

“(a) Is used without prejudice to questions of recognition or to whether a State is a Member of the United Nations;

“ . . .

“The first use of armed force by a State in contravention of the Charter shall constitute *prima facie* evidence of an act of aggression . . .”

139. This has been disregarded—deliberately disregarded—by both the representative of Jordan and the representative of Syria. And we are being told—the representative of Syria reminded us of this—that Syria itself was a member of the Committee that prepared that definition. I think this only aggravates that omission; this only aggravates the attempt to mislead the Council.

140. But this is not the only example of attempts to mislead the Council by the representative of Syria. In his statement on 6 January [*2322nd meeting, para. 177*], he read out what he alleged was a quotation from an article by Mr. Mordecai Bentov, who was a member of Israel’s Cabinet of National Unity, in *Al-Hamishmar* of 14 April 1971. We took the trouble of going back to the issue of 14 April of *Al-Hamishmar*. I must inform you, Mr. President, that there is no article by Mr. Bentov to be found in that issue.

141. Another attempt by the Syrian representative to mislead the Council occurred in his statement last

week. Let me quote from that statement. The Syrian representative said:

"In its resolution 100 (1953), the Council asked Israel to suspend drainage work in the demilitarized zone—another request which went unheeded." [*ibid.*, para. 40.]

Here again, the representative of Syria was apparently under the illusion that nobody would check on his statement. We did. And what we found was rather interesting.

142. First of all, resolution 100 (1953) has a paragraph—paragraph 2—which says:

"[The Security Council] notes with satisfaction the statement made by the Israel representative at the 631st meeting regarding the undertaking given by his Government to suspend the works in question during that examination."

143. Nor is that all. We also went back to the verbatim record of that meeting—the 631st meeting of the Council. We see in that verbatim record that the then-representative of Israel told the Council:

"I am empowered to state that the Government of Israel is willing to arrange such a temporary suspension in the demilitarized zone for the purpose of facilitating the Security Council's consideration of this question." [631st meeting, para. 4]

"The Government of Israel, in hereby accepting this idea, wishes in every way to assist the Security Council in its examination of the problem . . ." [*ibid.*, para. 6].

At the same meeting, Mr. Zafrulla Khan, the representative of Pakistan, said: "For my part, I welcome the statement by the representative of Israel" [*ibid.*, para. 8]. Perhaps the most interesting quotation that we have found is the following remark by Mr. Zeineddine of Syria: "The statement just made by the representative of Israel does indicate some change in the Israel Government's view" [*ibid.*, para. 15].

144. So we have come a long way since 1953. And the representative of Syria apparently believes that falsification of the Council's records can proceed with impunity.

145. While I apologize for the time I have taken, I should like to conclude with one request: let us make sure that no more butter is wasted.

146. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I now call on the representative of Jordan.

147. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): Mr. President, thank you for calling on me to make a statement in reply to the Israeli representative's totally irrelevant and

extraneous statements pertaining to issues other than that which is on the agenda.

148. This afternoon we are meeting to discuss the blatant and latest act of aggression of annexing the territory of a sovereign independent State, namely, the Syrian Arab Republic, without remorse, without apology, and without rescinding, as demanded by the Council, the application of the laws, jurisdiction and administration of Israel in the occupied Golan Heights.

149. But before I begin my rebuttal, I must say that I am somewhat curious in regard to the statement made in Hungarian by the representative of Israel. I was under the impression that he hailed from Czechoslovakia, and now I find that he seems to be proficient in Hungarian. So it would be interesting, for my own information and for the information of the other members of the Council, to know which it is, for the representative of Israel is seated here representing a territory called Palestine, and anyone who hails from a country other than Palestine has no right to speak on behalf of that territory of Palestine.

150. Secondly, it is baffling indeed that the representative of a country which has managed to achieve the incredible and dubious feat of imprisoning a quarter of a million citizens of the occupied territories of Jerusalem, the West Bank and Gaza over the relatively short period of 14 years should be sitting here in judgement on other Member States and interfering with their internal affairs. He has no right whatsoever to vilify the representatives whose conscience, courage and fidelity to the Charter have prompted them to speak on behalf of the Charter of the United Nations and its stipulations in cases of aggression.

151. I am surprised that the representative of Israel is confused as to what the definition of aggression is. I believe that I read a statement in which I quoted the considered opinion of the General Assembly in 1974 at its twenty-ninth session, in which it meticulously described what an act of aggression is: it is armed attack, occupation—even temporary occupation—or annexation of all the territory of another State or part thereof. That is the definition of aggression.

152. Because of the bankruptcy of the representative of Israel, it is clear that, confronting a consensus of the world community in the face of a crime unprecedented since the Second World War in conquering, colonizing and acquiring the territories of other peoples and States, he has chosen to divert attention to all the other regions of the world—or, at least, most of them.

153. Now, the representative of Israel spoke of the Polish situation, even though it is not permissible to discuss or even mention this matter without the request of the legitimate representative of the Government and the people of Poland. And yet he mentioned something about a request for an outlet to the

sea, forgetting that for 20 years his country's forces have been unleashed against the Palestinian people, which formed the majority of the population, and have managed by brutal force, massacres and expulsion to uproot the legal and lawful inhabitants of Palestine, leaving a truncated part of Palestine—the West Bank and Jerusalem—cut off from the Mediterranean for the first time in possibly a millennium, if not longer.

154. The representative of Israel has talked about whatever is happening between Arab countries, oblivious of the fact that all the Arab countries all the way from the Atlantic Ocean to the Persian Gulf regard themselves, as an article of faith, as belonging to one nation. They are peoples; but they are one nation. Whatever happens between them is an internal matter within a united Arab nation. These incidents happen in every country in the world. If we wanted to talk about incidents that happen in the United States, all we should have to do is listen to television broadcasts every evening, particularly the local 6 o'clock news, and we would then see the magnitude of the incidents which happen in the metropolitan New York area and elsewhere.

155. But I must remind the representative of Israel that the Arab countries are a nation one and indivisible. They consist of provinces; they were vivisected by the colonial Powers, which made them into separate entities—a situation which the entire Arab nation, leadership and people acting in concert are trying to surmount and overcome through functional, structural and other means. We are approaching this reunification because the present situation has become so cumbersome. As a matter of fact, had we retained our unity, which was deliberately disrupted by the colonial Powers, there would have been no Israel to usurp the lands of the Palestinian people. I am referring to the Sykes-Picot Agreement, which divided the entire territory of natural Syria into so many provinces. They are all our territory. We do not differentiate between Damascus and Amman. We are one people. We may differ in opinions; we may differ in approaches; we may differ in methods. That is only natural and common in the behaviour of practically every nation on earth.

156. It is therefore a futile effort on the part of the representative of Israel to try to drive a wedge between the various Arab provinces. We do have our differences, but we are united in our common goal of reunifying our entire Arab homeland from the Atlantic to the Arabian Gulf.

157. We are today discussing the situation in the Middle East and the latest Israeli act of aggression in annexing the occupied Syrian Golan Heights, which is an integral part of the Arab homeland. This has come on top of the prior annexation of Holy Jerusalem, a city holy to hundreds of millions of people throughout the world; it has come in addition to the colonization of more than 40 per cent of the occupied West Bank and Jerusalem. They have literally transformed

and mutilated the landscape; and they made no secret of their determination to annex territory the moment they seized more than 40 per cent of the lands and even more of the water resources, leaving our hapless and defenceless civilian population with no means of livelihood.

158. It is in no way out of generosity or respect for international law that they have not yet annexed the West Bank. They are biding their time until the moment comes when they have settled enough of their intruders there and sequestered a preponderance of the occupied territories of the West Bank and Jerusalem. Then we shall see the kind of annexation which occurred in the Golan Heights. Their annexation of the Golan Heights has nothing whatsoever to do with anything other than the fact that there are only remnants left of the original inhabitants of the Golan Heights numbering 200,000 souls who are now in the Diaspora as refugees living in other parts of Syria; the remaining people in the Golan Heights number a mere 12,000 to 13,000.

159. Now, whose property is the Golan Heights? It is the property of the 200,000 Syrians whose habitual home was the Golan Heights for 6,000 to 7,000 years of history. It is one of the oldest countries in the world and one of the main cradles of civilization.

160. I should like to remind the representative of Israel how Arnold Toynbee has described Israel in his monumental books on history. He has described it as a fossil of Assyrian civilization. And now, because of the division imposed upon us by colonial Powers for temporary reasons of olden days, the Israelis are trying to devour this land piece by piece, even though it constitutes the heartland of the Arab land.

161. I regret that the representative of Israel has seen fit to engage in diversionary tactics and to vilify so many esteemed and principled Members States simply because they expressed an honest opinion on which no two leaders in the world can disagree: that Israel has committed an unbridled act of aggression against a sovereign independent State, one of the founders of the United Nations. The result of his bankruptcy is that he has touched on almost all other parts of the world. Even his reference to Poland was a reference to 1940. The year 1940 happened to be one of the peaks of the Second World War, before we had a Charter or a United Nations. Since 1945, the Charter has been our guideline, and it is clear on what the rights and duties of States are, what the rights of citizens are and what constitutes aggression.

162. Up to this moment the representative of Israel has not said one word pertaining to the central issue of our entire debate: Israel's annexation of the occupied Syrian Golan Heights. The Council adopted a resolution on 17 December 1981 [*resolution 497 (1981)*] in which it decided, after condemning and denouncing

that act of annexation, that Israel should rescind it. Is the representative of Israel in a position to tell us that Begin and his clique are willing to abide by the rules of international law and the United Nations? Or are he and his group above the law? If so, I do not believe that there would be any necessity for the representative of Israel to waste his time attending the meetings of the Council to divert and distract the attention of the entire membership from the item on the agenda, which is the situation in the Middle East. If he wants to introduce any other item, he is entitled, as everyone else is, to do so, and then every State will be in a position to state its position on the particular subject.

163. This has been a brief reply because I know that the intent is to divert our attention and I regret that I partially fell into the trap of derailing our debate onto issues extraneous to it.

164. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic who wishes to make a statement in exercise of his right of reply.

165. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic): The hour is late and my reply is long. However, out of respect for the members of the Council, I shall be very brief now and answer in full tomorrow.

166. I do wish to state one thing: no raising of voices in the Council, no threats, no vilifications, no pressures, no smearing or slandering, no blackmail, can stop anyone from supporting the Syrian Arab Republic, a victim of Israeli aggression. To us, Viet Nam is a heroic country because Viet Nam broke the back of the United States and of Israel: the Israelis were getting their training in Viet Nam with the Green Berets. Mr. Dayan was one of them. I do not know if Mr. Blum also participated in the Viet Nam war, getting his training in anti-guerrilla activity.

167. Syria is honoured by the fact that so many countries have expressed their views not only to protect Syria—to remove the aggression against Syria—but also to defend the Charter of the United Nations, particularly its purposes and principles. Yet I should like also to remind the Israeli representative that he misquoted the Definition of Aggression [*General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), annex*]. He forgot one paragraph—article 5, paragraph 1—which reads: “No consideration of whatever nature, whether political, economic, military”—and I stress the word “military”—“or otherwise,”—and I stress the words “or otherwise”—“may serve as a justification for aggression.”

168. The entire Israeli reply to the Secretary-General was based on the premise that Syria is the aggressor. The Israeli representative has not read the paragraph I have just quoted; he does not want to read it; he does not like it.

169. We are proud of Cuba, which has defied the entire unjust system that was imposed on it by the United States. We are proud of Cuba, which we have freely elected Chairman of the non-aligned movement.

170. At the very moment when the Security Council was resuming its deliberations concerning Israeli lawlessness—its lawless annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights—Reuters' tickers were informing us that the Jewish Agency and the Golan Settlement Committee, in charge of colonization of the Golan Heights, had announced their plans to quadruple the number of settlers in the occupied Syrian territory. We saw this also in the *Daily News* of 7 January 1982.

171. I reserve my right to continue my statement, which comprises 12 pages. I do not want to take up any more of the Council's time this evening.

172. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I now call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to make a statement in exercise of his right of reply.

173. Mr. BLUM (Israel): With regard to the statement we have just heard from the representative of Syria, let me tell him in the Council that article 5 fully supports my contention: No consideration, of whatever nature, can justify the Syrian aggression against my country. No excuse, no pretext offered by the Syrian representative, can justify the fact that he refuses to sit down with us and negotiate with us on all the outstanding issues between our two countries, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). So he has no excuse for the ongoing Syrian aggression against my country.

174. With regard to the statement made by the representative of Jordan, I believe he made a slip of the tongue. As he knows, the country which I have the honour to represent here is Israel, as my nameplate also indicates.

175. He had some queries about what he perceived as my linguistic versatility. Let me very briefly tell him that some of us do speak foreign languages.

176. The Potsdam Conference, which I was quoting from, was in 1945, Mr. Nuseibeh, not in 1940—in July and August 1945, after the San Francisco Conference and after the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations.

177. We have heard from the representative of Jordan that the Arab nation is one and indivisible, which of course means that it has fully achieved its self-determination, which is now manifested in the existence of 21 independent and sovereign Arab States Members of the United Nations.

178. The representative of Jordan, in his statement, also created the impression that his country was a land-

locked State. It is not, of course; it has an outlet to the Red Sea. But with regard to access to the Mediterranean, I am sure the representative of Jordan knows that Israel has on more than one occasion indicated its readiness to negotiate with Jordan for Jordanian access and free port facilities on the Mediterranean. This could be one of the topics that we could profitably discuss when we sit down to negotiate peace, in compliance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

179. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. Maksoud, to whom the Council extended an invitation [2322nd meeting] under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, would like to make a further statement. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

180. Mr. MAKSOUUD: We have witnessed this afternoon a characteristic attempt at filibustering the proceedings of the Council. This is a deliberate attempt to reduce the Council's responsibilities from protecting security and peace in the world against annexationist and aggressive acts into a sort of playing to the gallery. This is an attempt by Israel to defuse this thrust of international anger at its obvious violation of the Charter of the United Nations of resolution 497 (1981) and of other resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly. It is an attempt to discredit the Council by transforming it from a credible and effective mechanism into a platform from which Israel repeats its abuse of any of the international critics of its behaviour patterns. Because of its inherent incapacity to answer the criticisms, it seeks to destroy the credibility of the critics. This is the diplomatic, intellectual and political terrorism that seeks to cover up the military and aggressive terrorism of which the annexation of the Golan Heights constitutes only the latest manifestation.

181. This attempt to discredit the Council, as well as the entire operations of the United Nations, and to reduce the United Nations to a sort of department where one has to be present, but which should not be of any consequence, constitutes one of the major aspects of aggression against the United Nations itself. This inherent indifference to the debate, to the deliberations of the Council is manifested by the attempt to deflect attention from the non-compliance of Israel with Council resolution 497 (1981), by venting instinctive prejudices and through semantic acrobatics, reviving the cold war. It is an attempt to appeal to a very limited and restricted constituency in the United States. Thus Israel seeks to paralyse the decision-making processes and project itself as the sole instrument of confrontation and cold war in the region. It does this by hurling repeated insults at the representatives of various countries who have spoken before the Council.

182. This is an expression of the recklessness in the proceedings which the Israeli representative seeks to

unfold and reveal. For recklessness is the protective shield for their lawlessness. That is why he has attempted to bring into the debate issues that have absolutely no relevance to the deliberations and are extraneous to the discussions. Thus he mentions certain inter-Arab differences, differences among the member States of the League of Arab States. And they do exist, because the League is to a very large extent a framework of Arab nationhood, to which the representative of Jordan has referred. The fact that historical and objective conditions have rendered the Arab nation into separate sovereign and independent States is only an indication of the degree of dynamic interaction among the Arab people and the Arab States. But in our serious debates, that fact does not at all deflect us from our national commitments to the integrity and sovereignty of Arab national territories. That is why Arab differences, which are transitionally presumed, cannot be taken as in any manner deflecting us from the absolute national commitment to the integrity and the sovereignty of Syria over the Golan Heights.

183. Furthermore, the Israeli representative has sought to define aggression as an act against sovereignty, implying that a sovereign Israel has been a victim of aggression by Syria in the past. The Security Council, Members of the United Nations, the whole world—all have asked repeatedly where the sovereignty of Israel starts and where it ends. If there is today any action in the Golan Heights which has been included in the broad definition of Israeli sovereignty over it, does that constitute aggression against Israel and its sovereignty? If the United Nations or the Arab nation determines that the settlements in the occupied territories and the occupation of East Jerusalem and its annexation in violation of the Security Council resolution are illegal acts, does that constitute violation and aggression against the sovereignty of Israel? Where does this sovereignty start and where does it end?

184. And the representative of Israel has the temerity to say that Syria refuses to negotiate with Israel—an Israel that is in occupation of Syrian territory. He says that Arab States whose territories are occupied and Palestinians whose rights are so openly violated must negotiate under duress—as if compliance with resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council becomes a matter of sacrifice on the part of Israel. Why should Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) assume the aura of being sacrosanct and resolution 497 (1981) be totally dismissed by the Israeli representative? Talk about double standards! Israel not only defies with contempt the resolutions of the Council but, equally, uses the filibustering techniques that have been manifested so blatantly this afternoon.

185. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I call on the representative of Israel.

186. Mr. BLUM (Israel): As the representative of Syria has kindly reminded us, we should not raise our voices here in the Council. And we should certainly not be influenced by the raising of voices by some speakers.

187. Let me very briefly reply to Mr. Maksoud. Syria and other Arab countries members of the League of Arab States refused to negotiate with us and to recognize our existence and our right to exist before 1967, at a time when we did not control the Golan. So I think he is misleading the Council when he tries to create the impression that the Arab aggression against Israel started in 1967, as if I had contended that. My point precisely all along has been that ever since the establishment of Israel in 1948, and even before that, Arab States, including Syria, Jordan and others, have been engaged in ongoing and unrelenting aggression against the very existence of Israel, which they refuse to recognize.

188. Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) contain the guidelines for a negotiated peace in the Middle East. They were both adopted after the six-day war of June 1967. So I think it is again misleading for Mr. Maksoud to maintain that negotiations cannot take place so long as the situation created in the wake of the six-day war is not undone. Quite to the contrary. What resolution 242 (1967) requires is that we sit down, accepting the existing *status quo*, to negotiate—without any prior conditions and following the guidelines laid down in the resolution—a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict. This Syria has been unwilling to do; this Jordan has been unwilling to do; and this is the rejectionist position for which Mr. Maksoud speaks, however much he raises his voice.

189. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I call now on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

190. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic): The Israeli representative abuses our intelligence.

191. Israeli representatives always start by speaking of 1967. The problem is not only that since 1967. The Israeli aggression against the Palestinian people started in 1948. This is the crux of the problem. Israel must withdraw unconditionally from our territory. Israel must recognize all the rights of the Palestinians: their national right to establish a State, their right to return to their homes and property and their right to live free of external interference. These are the conditions that would lead to a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement in the Middle East. Israel will never pronounce these words before the Council because we know the Israeli nature. This colonialist, settler and racist State cannot and does not wish to have peace. The word "peace" is only a slogan that has been flown for years and years. After every war we hear about a new "peace" from territories that Israel has been occupying from that moment. The repre-

sentatives of Israel forget other rights which existed before. They are completely forgotten. The rights of the Palestinians are completely forgotten.

192. We will not find a negotiator like the Government of Egypt in the Arab world any more. It is finished. Seek another man; you will not find him. We will not negotiate on the rights of the Palestinians. We in Palestine, Jordan and all the other Arab nations are one nation, as the representative of Jordan said. Israel is the intruder. Israel has occupied Palestine. Syria did not occupy Israel. Israel did not exist; Israel was imposed by the United States of America on our region to destroy our life, to control the strategic routes of the region and also to control our oil and our wealth. This is the character of Israel.

193. Israel lies everywhere. For Israel peace means annexation. We have been deflected in our debate from discussing the resolution that the Council adopted on 17 December last [*resolution 497 (1981)*]. It was never mentioned by the Israeli representative. The clause in which the Council demanded that Israel should rescind forthwith its decision to annex the Golan was never mentioned. The Israeli representative talked about almost all other countries, because those countries have decided to uphold the Charter of the United Nations. If the Charter is not applied in this case of Israel's blatant aggression against Syria, if the United States still exerts pressure on some Western countries not to vote in favour of the draft resolution calling for sanctions against Israel, then I see no future and no purpose for a United Nations. But Israel will not be able to destroy the United Nations.

194. The show was beautiful today; I enjoyed it.

195. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): I should simply like to thank the representative of Syria for all his very useful clarifications of the issues.

196. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic): I thank the representative of the United States for her very courteous reaction, but I did not understand it. Could she elaborate a bit? I did not understand it.

197. Really, I am very annoyed because I cannot understand it. I want to understand. Is she denying me the right to understand? Is this constructive ambiguity, or is it imperialist insinuation?

198. Please explain to me. I beg you.

199. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Cuba wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

200. Mr. LÓPEZ DEL AMO (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Since this is the first opportunity I have had to address the Council, permit me to do what has

already been done formally by the Permanent Representative of my country and greet the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, a distinguished diplomat from our continent, and publicly express to him, as we already have in private, our most sincere congratulations on his assuming the post of Secretary-General. We wish him every success in his complex and delicate tasks and we offer him the full support of our delegation in his work.

201. The representative of Israel has today offered us a parody of the Johnny Carson show, though his presentation has been much inferior in content and format and the Council is not a television studio.

202. We know that this year the United States has had a tremendous surplus of cheese but we did not know that Israel had a surplus of butter. The representative of Israel has poured butter all over us in an attempt to have the gravity of the situation slip away. The Council is meeting in order to consider Israel's attempt to annex part of the Syrian territory. The Zionist Government feels entitled to make use of the territory and to dispose of the lives of the Palestinian

people and other Arab neighbours, and it respects none of the decisions of the United Nations or the criteria expressed by international public opinion.

203. These aggressors *par excellence* cannot confound anyone with their diversionary tactics, nor can they offer excuses for their criminal acts.

204. We express the hope that the members of the Council will act with the requisite wisdom and firmness and will adopt the measures necessary to halt Zionist arrogance, which is one of the greatest threats to world peace.

*The meeting rose at 7.05 p.m.*

---

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 11th meeting, para. 127.

<sup>2</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973, p. 287.

<sup>3</sup> General Assembly resolution 217 A (III).

---

## كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يسكن الممول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من الكتيبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . امتعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب الى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

### 如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

### HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

### COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

### КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

### COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

---